



CTDEP Lean Journey: Lean VI Project Team Summary Status Report

Submittal Date: July 1, 2010

Lean Event Dates: January 25-29, 2010

Project: Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) Species Review Request Process

Bureau: Bureau of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division

Team: Total number of team members = 9 (5 staff within Division / 4 staff outside Division)

Team Sponsor(s)/Title(s): Rich Jacobson, Wildlife Division Director, Jenny Dickson, Supervising Wildlife Biologist

Team Leader(s)/Title(s): Kate Moran, Wildlife Resource Technician

Team Members /Titles: Dawn McKay, Environmental Analyst III; Karen Zyko, Environmental Analyst II; Julie Victoria, Wildlife Biologist II; Nancy Murray, Environmental Analyst III; Laura Saucier, Wildlife Resource Technician; Marilyn Stone, Human Resource Specialist; Bob Gilmore, Supervising Environmental Analyst; Dennis Schain, Director of Communications

Team Champion(s)/Title(s): Kim Hudak, Assistant Director Water Permitting and Enforcement Division

Opportunity Statement:

Improvement in the processing of Natural Diversity Data Base endangered, threatened, and special concern species review requests will reduce Agency permitting timeframes, help meet statutory requirements under the CT Endangered Species Act (PA 89-224), and improve distribution of critical natural resource information. These requests are filed by other state and federal agencies, project planners, environmental consultants, private landowners, and others. They are used to fulfill legal requirements and

Objective:

To identify inefficiencies in the NDDDB review process including: initial request completeness review; listed species record screening and review referrals; technical species review/sign-off; and data management and updating to enhance and maintain quality of listed species records.

Goals/Key Performance Indicators:

Pre-Kaizen Event Goals/Key Performance Indicators	Date: January 2010	Post-Kaizen Event Results	Status Date: July, 2010
Reduce request processing time by 15%. KPI = Turnaround time. Measuring turnaround for the new process will begin when SIMS is implemented. SIMS will permit reporting TAT for Level I and Level II requests separately. It is expected that Level I reviews will be turned around rapidly and Level II reviews will take longer. Previously all the reviews were treated in one work flow, but many of the more complex reviews were not tracked or had no hard closure date.		Initial estimates of turnaround time averaged 3-4 weeks, but these figures were based on incomplete data (not all staff included in this average). Turnaround varies greatly with complexity of the review and the varying quality of data submitted. Efforts toward using SIMS will allow more complete analysis of turnaround including all reviewers' work with closure dates for all reviews. In addition to process tracking, SIMs will allow document sharing among field staff, a single coordinated response to requesters, and coordination with permit analysts. We anticipate a reduction in interoffice correspondence that	

	<p>unnecessarily adds time and no value to the process.</p> <p>A database of standard species information is being populated for use in response letters. This will allow for more timely and consistent responses to requesters.</p>
<p>Produce standard guidelines for applicant (so that we get the info we need).</p> <p>KPI = Number of rejected requests should increase in the short term and decrease in the long term as incomplete requests will be no longer be entertained.</p> <p>Measuring # rejections will begin upon implementing SIMS, the new request form and guidance document.</p>	<p>A new request form has been developed with a companion guidance document. These two documents will provide standard instruction for requesters and ensure that we get the information needed to perform a review. All requesters will need to use the new form (including internal requests).</p> <p>Sufficiency reviews will be implemented. Incomplete requests will be rejected, thereby eliminating wasted staff time pursuing needed information.</p>
<p>Improve element occurrence records in the database.</p> <p>KPI = Number of NDDDB data submissions will increase as more capacity to conduct field work is created. One may need to compare a full year since data collection/submission is different in summer/winter. The following counts include LEAN team members only ("DEP"). Jan2009-June2009, total submitted 43; 2 were by DEP June 2009 – Jan 2010, total submitted 128; 15 were by DEP Jan2010-June2010, total submitted (so far) 12; 2 were by DEP</p> <p>It may take a couple of years before a trend is discernable. Even then it would be difficult to conclude that the trend is due to expanded capacity given that shifting priorities may mask or accentuate the trends.</p>	<p>All data submissions have been entered and a new edition of the NDDDB maps was published in June 2010.</p> <p>Field work is in full swing this season, contributing new information to the database on which species reviews are based. Time savings on reviews will translate into more time in the field.</p> <p>Added Ken Metzler's critical habitat data to NDDDB. Metadata has been written. Data is available on internal GIS SDE drive as well as on the public CT ECO as of March 1st.</p>
<p>Expedite review timeframe tied to related DEP permits or listed species takings issues.</p> <p>KPI = Ratio of Level I and Level II reviews. L I should be greater than L II</p> <p>Measuring this indicator will begin after the new process is implemented.</p>	<p>Approximately 50 % of reviews are tied to a DEP permits. Reviews will be sorted upon initial screening into different processing streams (Level I and Level II) based on the complexity of the review. Doing so will fast-track the less complicated reviews and free biologists to devote more attention to the more complex and permit-related reviews.</p> <p>Use of SIMs will also allow us to know whether a review is actually tied to a DEP permit. It will also allow permit analysts to check on the status of reviews. Previously they had no easy way to get status updates.</p>

Spaghetti Diagram showing distance traveled for the process under review during the *Pre-Kaizen phase: 30-60 miles, Post- Kaizen phase: 10 flights of stairs.*

Comments: Circulation of material to biologists in the field offices at Sessions and Franklin is estimated to be 30-60 miles round trip respectively. Once the new process is implemented, the most distance travelled would be round trip from the 6th floor to the 1st floor at 79 Elm to pick up /deliver the requests sent into CPPU.

Value Stream Mapping: While this exercise helped our team to understand what our current process lacked and what the new one should be, the comparison of steps would not be valid. Our process is being revised significantly; procedures for preparing responses varied widely based on biological factors and diversity of data received, and the ability to track the process was limited. As we begin to implement the new multi-tiered review process, including new forms and procedures, improvement will be reflected primarily in the consistency and quality of our reviews and in the protection we provide to Connecticut's listed species. While we will be streamlining NDDDB review requests in many ways through the use of SIMS, some aspects of the process may be expanded (e.g. generating species lists for review) in order to provide a more thorough and replicable review. As a consequence, our new process may not result in the dramatic reduction in steps typical of the other LEAN projects, but will certainly improve efficiency and standardize responses.

Highlights and Implementation of the Project Plan (2, 6 and 12 month deadlines):

Two Month Goals –

- Completed drafts of the new request form and guidance document.
- Coordinated with SIMS and CPPU to explore the use of SIMS.
- Created NDDDB E-mail account.
- Added Ken Metzler's critical habitat data to the NDDDB - also available on CT ECO and internal GIS Data server
- Developed an Access database for storing standard information about listed species.
- Inquired with legal council for clarification of the legal status of endangered, threatened and special concern species. Response pending.

Six Month Goals –

- Finalizing request form and guidance document for implementation.
- Developing a library of standard information for listed species - entering into the Access database (565 plant and animal species).
- Writing a standard operating procedure for the new work flow with details on interacting with SIMS, as well as training exercises for using SIMS.
- Lean team participated in a SIMS demo/training 6/9/2010 led by Dave Holmes and Karen Zyko.
- Karen Zyko and Nancy Murray completed 5 presentations for inland wetland commissions training –*“clarified how the IWA can use our info, where to find the maps and forms, and a bit about upcoming changes to our request form.”*
- All data submissions have been entered and a new edition of the NDDDB maps was published in June 2010.
- Data collection in the field is ongoing and will contribute to the database upon which reviews are based. Julie Victoria's notes from the field 6/21: *“Field season is progressing faster than we thought with the early warm weather. Puritan tiger beetles are flying earlier so Laura has begun her surveys almost a week in advance. Eagles and Peregrines have been banded. Osprey banding starts next week. Spent two days on bog turtles. Colonial Waterbird survey s and spadefoot toad study both underway. Plovers are time consuming especially with the fire at Long Beach on Friday night; I'll be spending tomorrow down there....”*
- Nancy Murray: *“I did a site visit to check on some habitat management we did for Isotria medeoloides, a state endangered plant/Federally Threatened. No plants were found, but the management actions may take another year to see results. Hopefully, I will get to do more field work that last year.”*

Twelve Month Goals –

- Looking into the possibility of charging a fee. Draft language being developed. Timeline in place for proposed amendments.
- Finalize SOP and implement Cross training – SIMs exercises will serve as a training tool.
- Explore possibility of landscape-level habitat mapping w/focus on herps

Additional Comments/Observations/WOWS/Innovations from the Team:

- KPIs are based on implementation of the new work flow which has not yet been done.
- Level one and level two streams of work flow will turn easy requests around quickly and not clog up the flow for Level II requests.
- Created capacity should result in more time in the field which feeds back into the database.
- Identified the need to establish more inferred extents for listed species which will help standardize species list generation.
- Timeline in place for proposing amendments to NDDDB legislation in order to charge a fee for reviews.

Revision Date: July 1, 2010